	Case 2:22-cv-00967-DAD-AC Docume	ent 6 Filed 04/17/24 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ROBERT EUGENE ROJAS,	No. 2:22-cv-00967-DAD-AC (PS)
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING THIS ACTION
14	COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	(Doc. No. 4)
16		
17	Plaintiff Robert Eugene Rojas, a former county jail inmate, is proceeding pro se in this	
18	civil action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States	
19	Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
20	On March 12, 2024, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations	
21	recommending that this action be dismissed, without leave to amend, due to plaintiff's failure to	
22	state a cognizable claim upon which relief may be granted. (Doc. No. 4.) The magistrate judge	
23	concluded that granting leave to amend would be futile because plaintiff does not allege any	
24	constitutional violations. (Id. at 3.) Further, the magistrate judge explained that plaintiff only	
25	alleges violations of patent and trademark law and such claims are also insufficiently pled	
26	because he does not allege that he has a patent, which is a prerequisite for this court's jurisdiction	
27	over such a claim. (Id.) Those pending findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff a	
28	his address of record and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within	
		1

twenty-one (21) days after service. (Id. at 4.) To date, no objections to the pending findings and recommendations have been filed, and the time in which to do so has now passed. In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis. Accordingly, 1. The findings and recommendations issued on March 12, 2024 (Doc. No. 4) are adopted in full; 2. This action is dismissed due to plaintiff's failure to state a cognizable claim; and 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case. IT IS SO ORDERED. **April 16, 2024** Dated: UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Case 2:22-cv-00967-DAD-AC Document 6 Filed 04/17/24 Page 2 of 2